UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,096	03/31/2004	Ying Yu Kuo	2519-0295PUS1	5658

77032   7590   11/13/2008
Joc McKinney Muncy
PO Box 1364
Fairfax, VA 22038-1364

EXAMINER
ZUBAJLO, JENNIFER L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/813,096	KUO ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	JENNIFER ZUBAJLO	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 July 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3/13/08*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Martin Meckesheimer (Pub. No.: US 2005/0162396 A1) in view of Philippe Junod

(Patent No.: US 5,854,621).

        As to claims 1 and 7, Meckesheimer teaches a wireless human input method and

system for constituting identification code utilized in a wireless human input device, in

which said wireless human input device is composed of a wireless human transmitting

device unequipped with memory and a wireless human receiving device, wherein said

wireless human receiving device being electrically connected to a computer, and the

method comprising following steps: (A) storing a predetermined identification code in a

non-volatile memory of said wireless human receiving device (see [0027] & figure 1A –

memory 18, receiver 13, and ID code 15 – note that Examiner is taking Official Notice to

the memory being non-volatile because it is common and well known in the art for a

wireless human receiving device to have nonvolatile memory for storing data); (B) using

a micro controller of the wireless human transmitting device unequipped with memory to

send a packet, which contains an identification code generated automatically by said

micro controller of said wireless human transmitting device, to said wireless human

receiving device during said wireless human transmitting device being set up for the first

time and said identification code comprising the same value as said predetermined

identification code (see [0049] & figure 1A – transmitter 11); (C) receiving said packet in

step B by said wireless human receiving device (see [0027] & [0049] – signal 50

(packet) contains ID code).

Meckesheimer does not directly teach detecting by said computer if said wireless

human receiving device in step C can receive normally via executing program codes,

and reading data from said non-volatile memory of said wireless human receiving

device by said computer via executing said program codes in case of normal receiving

being detected, comparing said predetermined identification code to said read data and

said computer outputting a message of said wireless human input device being normally

operated if a result being true after comparison; whereby, after completing the set-up for

the first time, an user of said wireless human input device can confirm said wireless

human input device having been normally set up already via said output message of

said computer in step D.

Junod teaches (D) detecting by said computer if said wireless human receiving

device in step C can receive normally via executing program codes, and reading data

from said non-volatile memory of said wireless human receiving device by said

computer via executing said program codes in case of normal receiving being detected,

comparing said predetermined identification code to said read data and said computer

outputting a message of said wireless human input device being normally operated if a result being true after comparison; whereby, after completing the set-up for the first time, an user of said wireless human input device can confirm said wireless human input device having been normally set up already via said output message of said computer in step D (see column 7 line 52—column 8 line 23 & column 9 lines 6-38 - note validity indicates true after comparison results and the output message is the blinking of the LED).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the detection of the wireless human receiving device taught by Junod into the wireless human input system and method taught by Meckesheimer in order to allow a receiver to differentiate between multiple transmitters.

As to claims 2 and 8, the combination of Meckesheimer and Junod teach the method and system as defined in claims 1 and 7 respectively (see above rejection). Junod further teaches wherein said output message is shown on a display (see column 7 line 52—column 8 line 23 – note blinking of the LED). Also, Meckesheimer teaches display output (see figure 1A).

As to claims 3 and 9, the combination of Meckesheimer and Junod teach the method and system as defined in claims 1 and 7 respectively (see above rejection). Junod teaches wherein said wireless human transmitting device is one of a wireless mouse transmitting device, a wireless keyboard transmitting device, a wireless joy stick

transmitting device and a wireless pointing transmitting device (see Abstract, column 2
lines 51-56, column 3 lines 2-9, column 4 lines 13-19).

As to claims 4 and 10, the combination of Meckesheimer and Junod teach the
method and system as defined in claims 1 and 7 respectively (see above rejection).
Junod teaches wherein said wireless human receiving device is one of a wireless
mouse receiving device, a wireless keyboard receiving device, a wireless joy stick
receiving device and a wireless pointing receiving device (see Abstract, column 2 lines
51-56, column 3 lines 2-9, column 4 lines 13-19).

As to claims 5 and 11, the combination of Meckesheimer and Junod teach the
method and system as defined in claims 1 and 7 respectively (see above rejection).
Meckesheimer teaches wherein after said message of said wireless human input
device normally working being output in step D, said method further comprises a further
step: (E) directing said user to change a new identification code with a value different
from that of said predetermined identification code via executing said program codes by
said computer, wherein said new identification code being automatically generated from
said micro controller of said wireless human transmitting devices and said non-volatile
memory of said wireless human receiving device being used for storing said new
identification code; whereby, said packets can be prevented from being interfered
during said wireless human receiving device carrying out receiving work (see [0027]).
This limitation is also taught by Junod (see Abstract).

As to claims 6, 12, and 13, the combination of Meckesheimer and Junod teach the method and system as defined in claims 1 and 7 respectively (see above rejection). Junod teaches allowing said non-volatile memory of said human receiving device to store said predetermined identification code via executing said program codes by said computer wherein a driver is composed of said program codes (see column 19-38).

Note: References cited include just some examples that Examiner feels best explain the prior art rejection. However, the entire references teach the scope of the claims in more detail. Examiner recommends that Applicant read the full disclosures.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Pub. No.: US 2005/0200594 A1 and US 2003/0160767 A1.

5.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JENNIFER ZUBAJLO whose telephone number is

(571)270-1551. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8 am - 5

pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Amare Mengistu can be reached on (571) 272-7674. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jennifer Zubajlo/
11/6/08

/Amare Mengistu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629